

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8  
9 RAMIRO NORIEGA, 1:05-CV-00543-AWI-WMW-HC  
10 Petitioner,

11 vs. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
12 U. S. BUREAU OF PRISONS,  
13 Respondent.

14 \_\_\_\_\_ /

15 Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for a writ of habeas  
16 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

17 On June 6, 2005, the court issued an order requiring Petitioner to submit a certified  
18 copy of his prison trust account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing  
19 of the petition OR pay the \$5.00 filing fee for this action, within thirty (30) days from the date of  
20 service of that order. The thirty-day period has passed, and Petitioner has failed to comply with or  
21 otherwise respond to the court's order.

22 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, the court must  
23 consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the  
24 court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the Respondents; (4) the public policy  
25 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and, (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
26 Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
27 1988). The court finds that the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the

28

1 court's interest in managing the docket weigh in favor of dismissal, as this case has been pending  
2 since April 11, 2005. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Respondents, also weighs in favor of  
3 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in  
4 prosecuting an action. Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1976). The fourth factor --  
5 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits -- is greatly outweighed by the factors in  
6 favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that failure to obey the  
7 court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives" requirement. Ferdik  
8 v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424. The court's  
9 order of June 6, 2005, expressly stated: "Failure to comply with this order will result in a  
10 recommendation that this action be dismissed." Thus, Petitioner had adequate warning that  
11 dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the court's order.

12 Accordingly, the court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that this action be DISMISSED  
13 for Petitioner's failure to prosecute. This Report and Recommendation is submitted to the United  
14 States District Court Judge assigned to the case pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636  
15 (b)(1)(B) and Rule 72-304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court,  
16 Eastern District of California. Within thirty (30) days after being served with a copy, any party may  
17 file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be  
18 captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation." Replies to the  
19 objections shall be served and filed within ten (10) court days (plus three days if served by mail)  
20 after service of the objections. The Court will then review the Magistrate Judge's ruling pursuant to  
21 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C). The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified  
22 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th  
23 Cir. 1991).

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 **Dated:** August 3, 2005  
bl0dc4

26 /s/ William M. Wunderlich  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27

28